

REMARKS

The examiner rejected claims 53 and 54 as being indefinite.

Applicants have amended claim 53 to indicate that the "system" referred to in the preamble clearly refers to a computer system, as described in Applicants' original specification. No new matter has been added.

The examiner continues to use Wilson, Zusman, Kampe and Lange to reject claims 44-63 as having been obvious.

Applicants continue to disagree and believe that the examiner's reliance on the cited references is misplaced, if not mischaracterized. For example, applicants' claim 44 recites "receiving a message in a receiver object..., attaching timing data from a timing object..., activating a translator object to translate the received message into a market event object, assigning the market event object to an entry in a queue object, validating the market event object entry and publishing the validated market event object entry in a sender object to a plurality of alert engines."

Wilson only teaches a gateway positioned between customer systems and market systems. All customer systems in Wilson use a common message protocol. The gateway in Wilson receives messages from the customer systems in the common message protocol and converts the common message protocol to other protocols for dissemination to the market systems. The gateway in Wilson also receives messages in the other protocols from the market systems and converts them to the common message protocol for receipt by the customer systems. More specifically, Wilson discloses:

The system according to the present invention includes a gateway which receives transaction information from and transmits transaction information to one or more systems, for example, located at one or more customers and/or one or more brokers, and from/to one or more systems, for example, located at one or more financial markets (exchanges). The transaction information may be transmitted and received by the gateway, by the customer and/or by the financial market (exchange) electronically, or some other way such as via an optical link. Customers and brokers are coupled to the gateway via a customer/gateway interface and financial markets (exchanges) are coupled to the

gateway via an exchange/gateway interface. (Col. 3, lines 15-27)

Wilson does not teach or suggest a receiver object, a timing object, a translator object market event object, a queue object, a sender object and alert engines.

The examiner argues that Wilson discloses "market event data from a plurality of feed lines."

On the contrary, Wilson teaches nothing more than transaction information in a single common format flowing between the customer systems and the gateway and transaction information of other multiple formats flowing between the gateway and market systems.

The examiner argues that Wilson discloses "placing time data on incoming messages."

Applicants agree that time data does help Wilson's intended purpose, which is only to handle transaction information obtained from lines of different transmission speeds. However, Wilson fails to disclose or suggest attaching timing data from a timing object to the received message, the timing data including a time extracted from the received message, a stamp indicating a receipt time at the receiver object and other data, since Wilson only provides a receipt time stamp, nothing more.

The examiner argues that "since the mechanisms to Wilson include processors that manipulate data, there are engines present." And the examiner argues that "since data is disseminated allows for informing a recipient there is present "alerts."

There is no basis in Wilson or any of the cited references to suggest applicants' alert engines. Wilson, as described above, is merely a gateway for translating transaction information to/from a common format and other formats. No "alerts" are disclosed or even suggested. Among its advantages, as described in applicants' original detailed description, "(t)he alert engine 20 includes an alert engine distributor 182, which distributes the message to a path through an execution stage, a data cache, and a coordination stage. These stages of the alert engine 20 determine whether the market event messages correspond to alert conditions. If an alert condition is detected, the alert engine distributor 182 publishes an alert on the private network 24."

The examiner argues that "since the gateway disclosed by Wilson allows movement of data, there is present "validation"."

Applicants respectfully disagree and are speechless; no one skilled in this art would ever conclude that a movement of data suggests validation.

The examiner argues that "since data is disseminated there is present "publishing"."

The examiner fails to recognize that applicants' claim 44 recites "publishing the validated market event object entry in a sender object to a plurality of alert engines." Wilson does not disclose or suggest the validated market event object, the sender object, and the alert engines. Among its advantages, as described in applicants' original detailed description, "(t)he publisher object 58 publishes the market event message on the private network 24 where the message is received by the alert engine 20."

Zusman, Kampe and Lange fail to make up for the multiple deficiencies of Wilson.

As described in detail in a previous reply, Zusman merely teaches a central ticker plant system for distributing financial market data that receives ticker feed data from many exchanges throughout the world, processes and formats the received data and then distributes or broadcasts the data to regional customers in the form of securities transactional data denoting the security identity and related transactional data. Zusman discloses no objects and no alert engines.

Kampe merely teaches a selective call device having a receiver for receiving a selective call signal including an address. An address correlator coupled to a decoder determines that the selective call signal is directed thereto and determines whether the selective call signal includes an update command. The update command includes a major version number, topic numbers associated with sub-message(s) stored in the selective call device, update data associated with each topic number for updating the sub-messages, and minor version numbers associated with each topic number. The major version number is incremented when a sub-message template is changed. Minor version numbers are incremented after each update. The selective call device updates a sub-message with update data only if the update command includes a current major version number and an incremented minor version number. Kampe discloses no objects and no alert engines.

Lange merely teaches an object request broker for receiving, aggregating and marshalling service requests from a software application server. More specifically, Lange discloses:

In a preferred embodiment depicted in FIG. 2, an Object Request Broker (ORB) 230 can be a workstation computer operating specialized software for receiving, aggregating, and marshalling service requests from the software application server 210. For example, the ORB 230 can operate a software product called Visibroker, available from Inprise, and related software products that provide a number of functions and services according to the Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) standard. In a preferred embodiment, one function of the ORB 230 is to provide what are commonly known in the object-oriented software industry as directory services, which correlate computer code organized into class modules, known as "objects," with names used to access those objects. When an object is accessed in the form of a request by name, the object is instantiated (i.e., caused to run) by the ORB 230. For example, in a preferred embodiment, computer code organized into a JAVA class module for the purpose of computing returns using a canonical DRF is an object named "DRF_Returns," and the directory services of the ORB 230 would be responsible for invoking this object by this name whenever the application server 210 issues a request that returns be computed. (Col. 89, lines 18-41)

This is different from applicants' a receiver object, a timing object, a translator object market event object, a queue object, a sender object and alert engines.

Accordingly, claim 44 is not rendered obvious by Wilson, Zusman, Kampe and Lange, whether taken separately or in combination.

Claims 53 and 55 recite similar language to the quoted features of claim 44. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 44, claims 53 and 55 are not rendered obvious by Wilson, Zusman, Kampe and Lange, whether taken separately or in combination.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this



Applicant : Ana Gabriela Anaya
Serial No. : 09/346,719
Filed : July 2, 1999
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 09857-018001

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

April 22, 2004

Kenneth F. Kozik

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20803785.doc

RECEIVED
APR 30 2004
GROUP 3600